

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figures 1, 1A and 2 to add the reference numeral "13". The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figure 1, 1A and 2, replaces the original sheet including these Figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1/10

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 24 and 28 are now pending in the application. Claims 4, 6-23 and 25-27 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned wishes to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview on August 20, 2007. The Examiner indicated that the proposed claim changes appeared to place the claims in allowable form, but that a supplemental search may need to be performed. Thus, the Examiner could not give a definite answer that the claims would be allowed.

DRAWINGS

A minor amendment has been made to Figures 1, 1A and 2 of the drawings to add reference numeral "13". This does not involve the addition of new matter into the specification at this time. Entry of these minor drawing amendments is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION

A minor amendment has been made to the written specification in paragraph 40 to specify that the tubular component has a "continuous, linear tapering outer wall 13". This

recitation of structure is fully supported by the specification and thus does not represent new matter. Entry of this minor amendment to the specification is respectfully requested.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 1-3, 5, 24 and 28 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over co-pending application S/N 10/822,531. Merely in the interest of expediting prosecution, a terminal disclaimer is being submitted disclaiming the terminal portion of the present application that would extend beyond the expiration of any patent that might be granted for the 10/822,531 application. It is believed that this obviates this ground for rejection and reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)

Claims 1-3, 5, 24 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pinker (U.S. Pat. No. 6,415,598). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it will be noted that claims 1, 24 and 28 have been amended to more positively recite that the nozzle has a “continuous, linear tapering outer wall over its entire length”. Such structure is not shown or suggested by Pinker. Pinker appears to involve a nozzle design having a curving outer wall, rather than a continuous, linear tapering outer wall. Pinker also does not mention using a beveled edge greater than about 5 degrees, as specifically recited in independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5, 24 and 28 were also rejected by the Examiner in view of Mathews et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,721). Mathews et al. also does not disclose or suggest an exhaust nozzle as now recited in the claims. The Examiner will note that Mathews et al. clearly makes use of a nozzle having a curving outer wall, and further does not include a “beveled” edge surface as that term is used in the written specification. Nevertheless, the term “linear” has been added to further define the beveled edge in the independent claims. Claim 1 has still further language that has been added to explicitly point out that the linear beveled edge extends from a top dead center to a bottom dead center of the downstream linear edge. Again, this structure is not shown or suggested by Mathews et al. Accordingly, Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of Mathews et al. is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5, 24 and 28 were rejected in view of Bhat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,288,984). For the reasons set forth above, this rejection is also respectfully traversed. The most relevant figure of Bhat et al. appears to be Figure 19, as noted by the Examiner. However, this figure only discloses a nozzle having a curved outer wall (labeled with number “7”). Again, the independent claims have been amended to differentiate the subject matter of the present application over this structure by highlighting the continuous, tapering outer wall of the nozzle. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 23, 2007

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/chs